[3rd November 1931

(c) whether it is a fact that consequent on the abandoned state of the Panjamthangi tank, the 155 acres of mamul wet lands lying below suffer much in the matter of their irrigation ordinarily;

(d) whether it is a fact that the above wet lands get their supply from the Periyakulam through the surplus vents, sluices I and II and the Panjamthangi tank;

(e) whether it is a fact that some dry lands to the north of sluice II are to be transferred to wet;

(f) what is the extra revenue the Government will get by transferring these lands to wet; and

(g) whether the Government will be pleased to direct that the transfer of the dry lands to the north of sluice II be postponed till the Panjamthangi tank is restored?

A.—(a) *to* (g) The Government have not the information. A report has been called for.

Issue of permits for water-rate cultivation in the Elundrakondan village.

* 559 *Q.*—Mr. M. D. T. Ranganatha Mudaliyar: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether the officers responsible for the grant of permission for water-rate cultivation in Elundrakondan village satisfied themselves when issuing permits in fasli 1340 that there would be sufficient supply for the mamul wet lands;

(b) how many acres of mamul wet lands mainly depend on the Panjamthangi tank for their irrigation after they cease to receive supply from the Elundrakondan Periyakulam;

(c) what is the capacity of the Panjamthangi tank and how many days' supply does it hold for the wet lands under it and whether the capacity is sufficient to give 40 days' supply to the lands east of it;

(d) whether it is proposed to transfer some dry lands to the east of the Panjamthangi tank to wet; and

(e) whether it is a fact that the wet lands east of the Panjamthangi and those fed by the surplus odai suffer from want of adequate supply when the water in the Periyakulam goes below the sill of the surplus vents?

A.—(a) *to* (e) The Government have not the information. A report has been called for.

Dry cultivation under Elundrakondan Periyakulam.

* 560 *Q.*—Mr. M. D. T. Ranganatha Mudaliyar: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) what is the source of irrigation for dry lands S. Nos. 39, 48, 52, 55, 56 and 57 under Elundrakondan Periyakulam now proposed for transfer to wet;

(b) how long these lands have been under water-rate cultivation;

(c) whether there is any plan marked channel to irrigate these lands;

3rd November 1931]

(*d*) whether these lands were not lowered and brought under water-rate cultivation in or about 1925;

(*e*) how many acres of mamul wet lands lie below these dry lands;

(*f*) whether it is a fact that the lower down mamul wet lands will be seriously prejudiced by allowing wet cultivation on these lands with tank water;

(*g*) whether it is a fact that wet lands irrigated by the surplus odai will get only 80 out of 120 days' supply in the Elundrakondan Periyakulam and for the rest of the period they have to depend on the Panjamthangi tank and even this tank is in an abandoned state and could not hold even rain water owing to the various acts of the dry land-owner;

(*h*) whether it is a fact that these lands are being irrigated by putting up a cross dam, across the surplus odai making new openings in the Panjamthangi tank-bund and excavating new channels in the rear slope of the Panjamthangi bund unauthorizedly;

(*i*) whether it is a fact that the owner of the above dry lands cut open the Panjamthangi tank-bund and was irrigating his dry lands above mentioned by inserting pipes and the ryots objected to the unauthorized irrigation in 1925–26;

(*j*) whether the Sub-Collector or any officer of the Public Works Department inspected these lands and the unauthorized acts of damage done to the Panjamthangi tank-bund by the owner of the dry lands in or about 1925; and

(*k*) whether the hon. Member will be pleased to lay on the table of the House the reports of the Sub-Collector and of the Executive Engineer, if any, on the objection petitions of the ryots and the orders of the Collector thereon, if any?

A.—(*a*) *to* (*k*) The Government have not the information. A report has been called for.

Water-rate cultivation under Elundrakondan Periakulam.

* 561 *Q.*—Mr. K. R. Venkatarama Ayyar: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Government are aware that water-rate cultivation is permitted for a very large area under Elundrakondan Periakulam;

(*b*) whether the Executive Engineer gave any opinion with regard to water-rate cultivation under this tank, and if so, what is his opinion;

(*c*) what is the extent of wet and water-rate lands that got below 12 annas yield during faslis 1336 to 1340 and what was the cause for the low yield, if any; and

(*d*) the ayacut under the tank at the old settlement;
the ayacut at the resettlement;
the extent of dry lands transferred to wet last fasli;
the extent of double crop wet lands under the tank;
the extent of dry lands now proposed to be transferred to wet?

A.—(*a*) *to* (*d*) The Government have not the information. A report has been called for.